UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/726,251	12/02/2003	Ludwig Eberler	P03,0469	3538
7590 05/22/2007 SCHIFF HARDIN & WAITE			EXAMINER	
Patent Department 6600 Sears Tower 233 South Wacker Drive			MAYO, TARA L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Chicago, IL 60606			3671	
		,	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION		ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	
10726251	12/2/03	EBERLER ET AL.	P03,0469		
		,	EXAMINER		
SCHIFF HARDIN & WAITE Patent Department 6600 Sears Tower 233 South Wacker Drive			Tara L Mayo		
			ART UNIT	PAPER	
Chicago, IL 60606			3671	20070511	

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

The reply brief filed 18 April 2007 has been entered and considered. The application has been forwarded to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for decision on the appeal.

PRIMARY EXAMINER

PTO-90C (Rev.04-03)

Service of the servic

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

APPELLANTS' REPLY BRIEF

APPELLANTS:

Eberler et al.

CONFIRMATION NO. 3538

SERIAL NO.:

10/726,251

GROUP ART UNIT: 3671

FILED:

December 2, 2003 EXAMINER: Tara L. Mayo

TITLE:

METHOD AND DEVICE FOR INSTALLING AND REMOVING A

STRUCTURAL COMPONENT OF AN MR APPARATUS

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF- PATENTS

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

SIR:

In accordance with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §41.41, Appellants herewith submit their Reply Brief in response to the Examiner's Answer dated February 21, 2007. This Reply Brief will reply to the statements of the Examiner in the Response to Argument section of the Examiner's Answer, beginning at page 9.

In response to Appellants' arguments that the combination of Heinold et al., Reimann and Carper et al. fails to teach a structural component that is separate from the patient support apparatus, the Examiner stated that the Heinold et al. reference teaches a structural component that is separate from the patient support apparatus, because the Examiner contends that the connection of the structural component and the patient supporting apparatus does not preclude them from being separate or individual members.

Appellants would agree with this statement of the Examiner if the alleged "connection" of the relevant components in the Heinold et al. reference was a type of connection that could be disassembled or even broken. Appellants submit, however,